Cornell University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic | Diagnostic Review Report

Host		Diagnosis	Confidence (to genus)			
Scientific Name	Common Name	This section reports samples from all statuses. Each sample may have one or more diagnosis or identification; hence this section does not represent the total number of samples	Confirmed	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive
Time Period Report for August 17th through August 30th, 2021						
Abies concolor	White Fir	High soil moisture (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Abies concolor	White Fir	Oedema; Edema (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Abies grandis	Grand Fir	Environmental stress; Problem (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Abies grandis	Grand Fir	Unspecified pathology (*Rhizosphaera* sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
Abies grandis	Grand Fir	Unspecified pathology (*Sclerophoma* sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
Acer saccharum	Sugar Maple	Discula anthracnose (*Discula* sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
Acer saccharum	Sugar Maple	Root damage (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Ajuga reptans	Bugleweed (ground cover)	Southern blight (*Sclerotium rolfsii*)	1	0	0	0
Amaranthus sp./spp.	Amaranthus; Pigweed	Damping off (*Fusarium* sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
Amaranthus sp./spp.	Amaranthus; Pigweed	Pythium root and/or crown rot (*Pythium* sp./spp.)	0	1	0	0
Aquatic habitat	Stock Tank; stock water supply	Insufficient sample (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0

Confirmed - The diagnosis was derived using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations which allowed for the confirmation of the organism to Genus, species and/or race or pathovar level.

Not Detected -The sample was submitted as a suspect sample or as part of survey project. The pathogen was not detected on this sample at this time using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations.

Suspected - Diagnostic symptoms of the pathogen were present but evidence of the pathogen could not be confirmed at this time. This term may also be used at the species level if confirmations cannot be made. This term may also be used with abiotic entries.

Inconclusive - Although a suitable sample was received, a reliable result could not be achieved. For example, the test kit may have not worked correctly and there was no sample material remaining to perform the test again. Or, no DNA was detected in a PCR analysis. Inhibitors may have been present in the sample. A second attempt may have been made with the same results. The only conclusion is to label the sample as inconclusive.

Cornell University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic | Diagnostic Review Report

Host		Diagnosis	Confidence (to genus)			
Scientific Name	Common Name	This section reports samples from all statuses. Each sample may have one or more diagnosis or identification; hence this section does not represent the total number of samples	Confirmed	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive
Aquatic habitat	Stock Tank; stock water supply	Unspecified pathology (*Pythium* sp./spp.)	0	0	0	1
Buxus sp./spp.	Boxwood	Additional sample requested (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
Buxus sp./spp.	Boxwood	Boxwood blight; Leaf and stem blight (*Calonectria pseudonaviculata*)	0	1	0	0
Buxus sp./spp.	Boxwood	Root damage (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Buxus sp./spp.	Boxwood	Unspecified pathology (*Phomopsis* sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
Capsicum annuum	Pepper	Cucumber mosaic (CMV) (Cucumovirus Cucumber Mosaic Virus)	0	1	0	0
Capsicum annuum	Pepper	Oedema; Edema (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Chionanthus retusus	Chinese Fringetree	High soil moisture (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Chionanthus retusus	Chinese Fringetree	No pathogen found (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
Citrullus lanatus	Watermelon	Cucurbit bacterial wilt (*Erwinia tracheiphila*)	2	0	0	0
Citrullus lanatus	Watermelon	Cucurbit gummy stem blight (*Stagonosporopsis curcubitacearum*)	1	0	0	0
Citrullus lanatus	Watermelon	Melon Fusarium wilt (*Fusarium oxysporum melonis*)	1	0	0	0
Cornus florida	Flowering Dogwood	Insect feeding damage (Unidentified Insect)	5	0	0	0

Confirmed - The diagnosis was derived using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations which allowed for the confirmation of the organism to Genus, species and/or race or pathovar level.

Not Detected -The sample was submitted as a suspect sample or as part of survey project. The pathogen was not detected on this sample at this time using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations.

Suspected - Diagnostic symptoms of the pathogen were present but evidence of the pathogen could not be confirmed at this time. This term may also be used at the species level if confirmations cannot be made. This term may also be used with abiotic entries.

Inconclusive - Although a suitable sample was received, a reliable result could not be achieved. For example, the test kit may have not worked correctly and there was no sample material remaining to perform the test again. Or, no DNA was detected in a PCR analysis. Inhibitors may have been present in the sample. A second attempt may have been made with the same results. The only conclusion is to label the sample as inconclusive.

Cornell University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic | Diagnostic Review Report

Host		Diagnosis	Confidence (to genus)			
Scientific Name	Common Name	This section reports samples from all statuses. Each sample may have one or more diagnosis or identification; hence this section does not represent the total number of samples	Confirmed	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive
Cornus florida	Flowering Dogwood	Moisture stress (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	5	0
Cornus florida	Flowering Dogwood	Powdery mildew (*Oidium* sp./spp.)	5	0	0	0
Cornus florida	Flowering Dogwood	Sooty mold (Unidentified Fungus)	4	0	0	0
Cucumis sativus	Cucumber	Cucurbit downy mildew (*Pseudoperonospora cubensis*)	1	0	0	0
Cucurbita pepo	Field Pumpkin	Additional sample requested (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
Cucurbita pepo	Field Pumpkin	No pathogen found (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
Cucurbita pepo	Field Pumpkin	Unknown abiotic disorder (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Fagus grandifolia	American Beech	Additional sample requested (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
Fagus grandifolia	American Beech	Polypore mushroom (*Phlebia incarnata*)	0	0	1	0
Heliotropium arborescens	Heliotrope	Verticillium wilt (*Verticillium* sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
Hibiscus sp./spp.	Hibiscus	Insect feeding damage (Unidentified Insect)	0	0	1	0
Hibiscus sp./spp.	Hibiscus	No pathogen found (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
Hibiscus sp./spp.	Hibiscus	Nutritional deficiency (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0

Confirmed - The diagnosis was derived using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations which allowed for the confirmation of the organism to Genus, species and/or race or pathovar level.

Not Detected -The sample was submitted as a suspect sample or as part of survey project. The pathogen was not detected on this sample at this time using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations.

Suspected - Diagnostic symptoms of the pathogen were present but evidence of the pathogen could not be confirmed at this time. This term may also be used at the species level if confirmations cannot be made. This term may also be used with abiotic entries.

Inconclusive - Although a suitable sample was received, a reliable result could not be achieved. For example, the test kit may have not worked correctly and there was no sample material remaining to perform the test again. Or, no DNA was detected in a PCR analysis. Inhibitors may have been present in the sample. A second attempt may have been made with the same results. The only conclusion is to label the sample as inconclusive.

Cornell University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic | Diagnostic Review Report

Host		Diagnosis	Confidence (to genus)			
Scientific Name	Common Name	This section reports samples from all statuses. Each sample may have one or more diagnosis or identification; hence this section does not represent the total number of samples	Confirmed	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive
Humulus lupulus	Hops	Hop downy mildew (*Pseudoperonospora humuli*)	1	0	0	0
Humulus lupulus	Hops	Twospotted spider mite (*Tetranychus urticae*)	0	1	0	0
Juniperus chinensis pfitzeriana	Pfitzer Juniper	Phomopsis tip blight; Needle blight (*Phomopsis juniperovora*)	1	0	0	0
Poa pratensis	Bluegrass; Kentucky bluegrass	Dense thatch layer (Abiotic disorder)	1	0	0	0
Quercus coccinea	Scarlet Oak	Referred to specialist (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
Quercus sp./spp.	Oak	Leaf scorch (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Quercus sp./spp.	Oak	Non-pathogenic; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0	0	0
Quercus velutina	Black Oak	Referred to specialist (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
Rhododendron indicum	Azalea	Non-pathogenic; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0	0	0
Rhododendron indicum	Azalea	Root damage (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Rhododendron indicum	Azalea	Spider mites (Family Tetranychidae)	1	0	0	0

Confirmed - The diagnosis was derived using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations which allowed for the confirmation of the organism to Genus, species and/or race or pathovar level.

Not Detected -The sample was submitted as a suspect sample or as part of survey project. The pathogen was not detected on this sample at this time using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations.

Suspected - Diagnostic symptoms of the pathogen were present but evidence of the pathogen could not be confirmed at this time. This term may also be used at the species level if confirmations cannot be made. This term may also be used with abiotic entries.

Inconclusive - Although a suitable sample was received, a reliable result could not be achieved. For example, the test kit may have not worked correctly and there was no sample material remaining to perform the test again. Or, no DNA was detected in a PCR analysis. Inhibitors may have been present in the sample. A second attempt may have been made with the same results. The only conclusion is to label the sample as inconclusive.

Cornell University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic | Diagnostic Review Report

Host		Diagnosis	Confidence (to genus)			
Scientific Name	Common Name	This section reports samples from all statuses. Each sample may have one or more diagnosis or identification; hence this section does not represent the total number of samples	Confirmed	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive
Rhododendron sp./spp.	Rhododendron	Crown and root rot (*Phytophthora* sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
Rhododendron sp./spp.	Rhododendron	Planting too deep (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Rosa sp./spp.	Rose	No pathogen found (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
Rosa sp./spp.	Rose	Nutritional pathology (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Salix sepulcralis	Weeping Willow	Additional sample requested (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
Salix sepulcralis	Weeping Willow	Mechanical damage (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Stewartia pseudocamellia	Japanese Stewartia	Moisture stress (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Stewartia pseudocamellia	Japanese Stewartia	No pathogen found (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
Tsuga sp./spp.	Hemlock	Non-pathogenic; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0	0	0
Turfgrass	Turfgrass	Brown patch (*Rhizoctonia* sp./spp.)	0	0	1	0
Turfgrass	Turfgrass	High soil moisture (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Turfgrass	Turfgrass	Insect damage (Unidentified Insect)	0	0	1	0
Ulmus americana	American Elm	Black spot (*Stegophora ulmea*)	1	0	0	0

Confirmed - The diagnosis was derived using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations which allowed for the confirmation of the organism to Genus, species and/or race or pathovar level.

Not Detected -The sample was submitted as a suspect sample or as part of survey project. The pathogen was not detected on this sample at this time using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations.

Suspected - Diagnostic symptoms of the pathogen were present but evidence of the pathogen could not be confirmed at this time. This term may also be used at the species level if confirmations cannot be made. This term may also be used with abiotic entries.

Inconclusive - Although a suitable sample was received, a reliable result could not be achieved. For example, the test kit may have not worked correctly and there was no sample material remaining to perform the test again. Or, no DNA was detected in a PCR analysis. Inhibitors may have been present in the sample. A second attempt may have been made with the same results. The only conclusion is to label the sample as inconclusive.

Cornell University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic

Diagnostic Review Report

Host		Diagnosis	Confidence (to genus)			
Scientific Name	Common Name	This section reports samples from all statuses. Each sample may have one or more diagnosis or identification; hence this section does not represent the total number of samples	Confirmed	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive
Ulmus americana	American Elm	Dutch elm disease (*Ophiostoma* sp./spp.)	0	1	0	0
Viburnum sp./spp.	Viburnum	No pathogen found (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
Viburnum sp./spp.	Viburnum	Unknown abiotic disorder (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Vitis sp./spp.	Grape	Chemical; Environmental injury (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Vitis sp./spp.	Grape	Non-pathogenic; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0	0	0

Confirmed - The diagnosis was derived using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations which allowed for the confirmation of the organism to Genus, species and/or race or pathovar level.

Not Detected -The sample was submitted as a suspect sample or as part of survey project. The pathogen was not detected on this sample at this time using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations.

Suspected - Diagnostic symptoms of the pathogen were present but evidence of the pathogen could not be confirmed at this time. This term may also be used at the species level if confirmations cannot be made. This term may also be used with abiotic entries.

Inconclusive - Although a suitable sample was received, a reliable result could not be achieved. For example, the test kit may have not worked correctly and there was no sample material remaining to perform the test again. Or, no DNA was detected in a PCR analysis. Inhibitors may have been present in the sample. A second attempt may have been made with the same results. The only conclusion is to label the sample as inconclusive.